

knowing, and not wanting to know, the exact number of nuclear weapons in the country's arsenal. "Mr. President, you should know," said Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace. But Truman kept his distance, leaving nuclear arms production to the military and Atomic Energy Commission.

Once again, it is Clinton who has stepped up to plate and explained the extent of the mess: It will take, the administration announced, 70 years and between \$230 and \$350 billion to clean up the toxic waste produced by the production of nuclear arms.

You do not have to stop at our shores to come to the conclusion that Clinton has thus far outshone Truman. The great foreign policy decisions attributed to Truman, remember, did not come until later in his term. In the spring of 1947, the country was reeling from the succession of communist victories. Every Eastern European country had fallen to communism except Czechoslovakia, which would not be far behind. China's fall to communism was imminent. And with the reckless use of its veto in the United Nations, the Soviet Union was halting American efforts to shape the post-war world. The United States, it seemed, was on the ropes.

Meanwhile, Clinton's foreign policy, though ridiculed mercilessly by Republicans, has been, on the whole, refreshingly successful. The passage of NAFTA and GATT were hard-fought and significant victories. Other successes have been jawdroppers. Answer me this: If you were told two years ago that Israel would sign peace agreements with the PLO and Jordan; that Haiti would have a democratically elected president; that there would be a cease-fire in Northern Ireland; and that the third-largest nuclear power in the world would voluntarily disarm its nuclear capability, what would you say? That's what I thought.

All four developments, to varying extents, can be credited to a foreign policy team that has been derided as hopelessly incompetent. The success has even impressed Owen Harries, editor of the conservative National Interest. "The charge against the Clinton Administration has been that it is all show and no substance," Harries wrote in *The New Republic*. "But the opposite may be nearer the mark.... [S]ome sensible decisions have been made and some dangers avoided. It could have been a lot worse if the advice given by many of the people now criticizing Clinton had been followed."

Take Ukraine, a newborn Soviet successor state with a government considerably less than stable, which suddenly found itself holding the third-largest arsenal of nuclear weapons in the world. Clinton, Gore, and Secretary of State Warren Christopher pressured and cajoled the country to abandon its hopes of becoming a nuclear power. Under this constant pressure, Ukraine agreed last November to dismantle its 1,800 nuclear warheads. Kazakhstan and Belarus, with considerably smaller nuclear forces, followed suit, giving the world three less nuclear nightmares to worry about.

In the Middle East, the first praise for peace accords certainly goes to the major players: Israel, the PLO, and Jordan. But the Clinton Administration deftly walked a very fine line: Israel would never have agreed to the deal without a strong friend in Washington, while the Palestinians and Jordanians would have balked if they felt the administration was one-sided or unfair to their concerns. It is a testament to the trust won from both sides that the peace treaty was signed on the White House lawn.

Most pundits felt that democracy in Haiti was a pipe dream. Bush hemmed and hawed as the military junta settled in and terrorized the Haitian people; thousands fled to the United States. But Clinton's policy, despite

messy appearances, has led to the bloodless overthrow of a military dictatorship and the restoration of that country's first democratically elected president.

And in an effort to bring an end to the decades-long fighting in Northern Ireland, Clinton has stood up to England (our "special relationship" notwithstanding) to force it to deal with its troubles in Northern Ireland. When in 1993 Clinton agreed to grant a visa to Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams to visit the United States for the first time, British legislators openly insulted the President, saying that America had betrayed its trust. But over British objections, Clinton has allowed Adams to return twice more to meet with the administration and continue the push for peace. Eight months into the cease-fire, Clinton's persistence has paid off in lives.

True, there is no "Clinton Doctrine" by which to measure every foreign policy question that comes down the pike. It would no doubt make things easier if there were. But simple doctrines work in simple worlds. Presidents from Truman to Reagan could vow to fight communism wherever it reared its head. Whether or not they met their promise, they at least had the pose.

Clinton, then, is being penalized because there is no mortal threat to the country. The vast majority of armed conflicts in the world today are either civil wars or ethnic conflicts. No simple formula applies. The process has at times seemed messy, but in a subtle and deft fashion, Clinton has loosened diplomatic knots of Gordian complexity.

Truman went on, of course, to make some the shrewdest and politically courageous decisions of the century: the Marshall Plan in the summer of 1947; the desegregation of the military in 1948; and the Berlin Airlift that same year, which, without provoking war with the Soviet Union, broke the blockade of West Berlin. While pundits hang the lame-duck tag on Clinton, they ignore that if Clinton maintains this pace, and continues to better Truman domestically and abroad, Americans could see an enormously successful presidency.

Similarly, the predictions that Clinton has no chance in 1996 miss a crucial point. Like Truman, Clinton has an uncanny ability to project an empathy with the American people. Truman was profoundly unpopular at this point in his first term. In November of 1946, his approval ratings stood at 32 percent. But in 1948, voters compared the warmth and humility of Truman to the arrogance of Thomas Dewey and chose the man they felt cared most about their problems. By this standard, Bill Clinton will never suffer from comparison to a man like, for example, Phil Gramm. Clinton could still pull off that Trumanesque comeback, and those who wish to make parallels between the Man from Independence and the Man from Hope will have one more comparison to draw.

#### CLEAN WATER ACT AMENDMENTS

##### HON. FRANK RIGGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the House approved amendment No. 66 to H.R. 961, the Clean Water Amendments of 1995, without objection. Under its terms, municipal wastewater reuse facilities that utilize advanced treatment will be added to the existing section 404(f) activities not requiring permits. By facilitating the regulatory process for those cities that have treated wastewater to a

high degree, the effect of the amendment will be to encourage the use of properly treated wastewater to restore degraded wetlands and create new wetlands.

In specifying municipal wastewater treatment facilities in the amendment, I was not implying that other, nonmunicipal wastewater reuse activities that utilize advanced treatment for similar purposes now require a permit under the act if exempted by other provisions. My amendment does not affect those other provisions of the Clean Water Act. Thus wastewater reuse facilities which have long been exempt, such as those operated successfully by the forest products industry, would continue to be exempt from the permit process.

#### HONORING ESSAY WINNERS

##### HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the pleasures of serving in this body is the opportunity we occasionally get to recognize truly outstanding and talented citizens of this country. Today, I am especially pleased to recognize the winners of the fifth annual drug avoidance essay contest.

The first place winners are Tracey Barnes of PS 93, Gloria Milan of PS 380, Jessica Schumer of PS 230, Aisha Matthew of PS 138, Danielle Moseley of PS 244, Shameka Jackson-Barrington of PS 214, Michael Falanga of PS 205, Alexis Legister of PS 139 Annex, Bryan Small of PS 327, Jennifer Fringo of PS 86K. I am also pleased to acknowledge the runners up: Radiance Salem of PS 11, Latoya Sanabria of PS 257, Iasia Holloway of PS 124, Grace Berry of PS 221, Lauren Stambler of PS 114, Jamece Grey of PS 149, Meghan O'Brien of PS 127, Michael Albala of PS 206, Stacy Adams of PS 298, Joseph Williams of PS 75K, Glenfield Browne of PS 305, Charnise Sutton of PS 297, Enas Ahmed of PS 131, Blas Brown of PS 167, Tristan Brathwaite of PS 268, Giselle Cabon of PS 158, Lyndsay Adesso of PS 204, Jason Wilk of PS 312, Candice McMeans of PS 73, Juan Arcena of PS 384K.

Reading over the essays I cannot help but think of how wise these young students are. They know the terrible cost of drugs on individuals, families, cities and our country. These essays challenge us to do better by our children; they deserve to grow up in a safe, drug-free environment. I know my colleagues in the House of Representatives will join me both in congratulating the winners and runners up of the drug-free essay contest, and in wishing them the best of luck in the future.

#### RESCISSION BILL VETO THREAT

##### HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, despite his rhetoric, the President obviously cares nothing about balancing the budget. He leaves a conspicuous open seat at the budget cutting